

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3
4 JOSHUA CRITTENDON,

5 Plaintiff

6 v.

7 MACHAM, *et al.*,

8 Defendants

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01205-JAD-EJY

**Order Dismissing Action and
Closing Case**

9
10 Plaintiff Joshua Crittendon brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges
11 occurred during his incarceration at Clark County Detention Center.¹ On September 18, 2019,
12 the magistrate judge denied plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* without
13 prejudice because the application was incomplete and gave him 30 days to file a fully completed
14 application or pay the \$400 filing fee.² The court expressly warned plaintiff that his failure to
15 file the completed application or pay the filing fee by that deadline would result in the dismissal
16 of this case.³ The deadline has passed, and plaintiff has done neither.

17 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of
18 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.⁴ A
19 court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action,
20 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁵ In determining whether to

21
22 ¹ ECF No. 1-1 (complaint).

23 ² ECF No. 8 (order).

24 ³ *Id.*

25 ⁴ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

26
27 ⁵ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with
28 local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to
comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with
2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious
3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
5 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁶

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the
7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.
8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury
9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
10 prosecuting an action.⁷ The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in
12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁸ Plaintiff was warned that his
13 case would be dismissed if he failed to file a fully completed application or pay the \$400 filing
14 fee.⁹ So plaintiff had adequate warning that his failure to pay the fee or submit a completed
15 application would result in this case's dismissal.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without
17 prejudice based on plaintiff's failure to file a fully completed application or pay the \$400 filing
18 fee in compliance with this Court's September 18, 2019, order; and
19
20

21 41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to
22 keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.
23 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

24 ⁶ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
25 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

26 ⁷ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

27 ⁸ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

28 ⁹ ECF No. 3 (order).

1 The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS
2 CASE.

3 Dated: October 29, 2019

4 
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey